

# THE

# COLONIAL NEWSLETTER

P.O.Box 4411

Huntsville, Alabama 35802

J.C.Spilman, Editor

Volume 7, No. 4

December 1968

Serial No. 24



GENUINE FUGIO  
Newman Obverse 5



## WHY NOT ?



NEW HAVEN RESTRIKE  
Douglas Obverse 95

## editor's notebook



It is always encouraging to those of us interested in Colonial American Numismatics when an authoritative article on the subject appears in the popular literature. Such an occurrence was the interesting work by Don Taxay in the October 1968 issue of Coins magazine on the subject of the Fugio "Patterns" and "New Havens". Those who have not read his article should make every effort to do so as it expresses very nicely some recognized but unpublished aspects of these "problems" within the Fugio family.

Mr. Taxay develops the thesis that there are two genuine Fugio patterns -- Newman varieties 1-CC and 102-GG -- and further establishes the proposition that the "New Haven Restrikes" varieties 104-FF and others which he designates as 105 and 106 (Douglas numbers 96 and 94 respectively) are mid-1800 fabrications originating from new master dies from which hubs and working dies were afterwards multiplied. He classifies these without reservation as fabrications and dismisses Mr. H. N. Rust as a pseudonym whose real identity remains unknown.

In general, we agree with much of what Mr. Taxay has said in his interesting work; however, there is so very much more to this matter, especially that dealing with the "New Haven" dies and Mr. H. N. Rust that we are presenting in this issue of CNL some related data and ideas which we believe will be of interest to our patrons.

The first of these are extracts from a number of letters which we have received from Robert J. Lindesmith regarding RF-21 of the Research Forum published in the July 1968 issue of CNL which requested information on the identity of H.N. Rust and his relationship to the business and numismatic community. The second is another in ye editor's series of Comments on the Fugio Cents of 1787 and presents some observations and ideas on the reasons for the existence of the "New Havens" and some clues to their true origin.



Within the next few weeks each of our friends and patrons will receive in the mail a request for financial support for The Colonial Newsletter. As some of you know, this project is a spare time effort on the part of ye editor who works for The Boeing Company in Huntsville on the Saturn/Apollo Space Program. Available time, material for publication, and funds are all in short supply. While CNL is a not-for-profit activity it is necessary that it be self supporting to a reasonable extent. In the past many of you have been generous with your financial support while others have done nothing. If you are sincerely interested in CNL and its subject matter - please help! Thank you.


# LETTERS and TECHNICAL NOTES

- from Damon G. Douglas

Thanks for your latest Colonial Newsletter with the reprint of my humble effort (The Original Mint of the New Jersey Coppers, CNL Vol. 7, No. 3, July 1968, pp. 27-31). Re-reading it brought back many pleasant memories of the days and months of digging to uncover clues enough to fill in the mosaic.

- from J. C. Spilman  
FUGIO PRODUCTION PATTERNS (TN-10)

In his Coins magazine discussion of Fugio "New Havens" and "Patterns" (October 1968), Don Taxay refers to Newman Obverse 1 as a pattern through its association with Reverse CC. I would like to suggest that Obverse 1 be considered as a pattern simply on its own merit:

- a. Lettering for FUGIO and MIND YOUR BUSINESS are hand engraved rather than punched, so also is the crude quatrefoil. The unusual serrated letter font design on MIND YOUR BUSINESS was carried over to the production punches.
- b. Fine line design detail of hub between dialplate of sundial and its support transferred nicely to the die (quickly destroyed during subsequent use of the hub) indicating the first or second sinking from this hub.
- c. While the hand engraved letter fonts on MIND YOUR BUSINESS match the WE ARE ONE design on Reverse CC--more importantly, they also match the original font design of WE ARE ONE on Reverse Z, which I believe is also a pattern die, i.e., 1 - Z is probably the only true production pattern. See my comments on Reverse Z in CNL S/N 7, page 5, paragraph 6.
- d. The production punches for ornamenting the dialplate (thereby covering the hub error on IIII) were not used; instead, a rather plain slash punch  was utilized for this task.

There are several other peculiarities of the Obverse No. 1 die which may be of interest. This die was a relatively poor sinking, probably due to a sunken matrix, and some hand touchup was necessary to strengthen the design. In accomplishing this, the numeral IX on the dialplate became X with the result that Obverse No. 1 displays two numeral X's, one on each side of the gnomon.

● from Ted Craige

NEW 1787 CONNECTICUT 52-G.2 (TN-11)

I have discovered and have now in my collection a 1787 Connecticut 52-G.2. This 52 obverse of 1787 has previously been known paired only with G.1. The G.2 reverse has previously been found paired with the Machin Mill "Small Head" Georgivs III Rex effigy, and no other; in this combination it is designated 101-G.2. The G.2 has never been found on any Connecticut coin until now.

The points of differentiation of G.1 and G.2 1787 Connecticut reverses are described in the April 1968 issue of The Colonial Newsletter, page 16, (TN-6).

The discovery coin 52-G.2 is plated as Lot 334 in the recent New Netherlands' sale catalog of their 60th public auction. Contained therein is an excellent photo of both obverse and reverse for future reference of this important specimen.

It should be noted that the G.2 reverse, when paired with the 52 obverse, is a much earlier die state than when muled with the Georgivs III Machin. Also the 52 obverse is a much earlier state when combined with the G.1 reverse. The 52-G.1 pairing frequently exhibits serious clicking of dies and advanced die state of the 52 obverse die.

All collectors owning 52-G.1 specimens are requested to check them carefully to be certain they are not 52-G.2. Until another is reported, the 52-G.2 may be considered unique.

The Connecticut and Machin Mill tie-in is once again reaffirmed.

● from Walter Breen

ADDITIONAL COMMENT ON ST. PATRICK FARTHING (TN-7A)

Documentation of noncollector accumulations included in estates or brought in by the traditional little old ladies with tennis shoes, generally to this or that coin dealer who valued the lots as slightly above average junk, would be hard indeed to find. This sort of thing hardly ever reaches public print. I myself have seen enough such accumulations to convince me that the St. Patrick farthings had 18th century American circulation, but the condition was always so worn as to suggest that they passed merely as coppers--even as did the worn-out halfpence, Woods and Rosas. In no case could anything more be deduced, otherwise I would have long ago had material for a supplement to my studies of American coin hoards. Possibly every such instance should have been recorded, but it did not seem then worthwhile as the coins were too poor for variety recording.

I can add that the halfpence included a few almost illegible Charles II and William III pieces but were mostly George I and II. I do not remember now seeing halfpence of George III in the same lots with the Woods, Rosas and St. Patrick coins--but since memory is notoriously unreliable on things of this kind, maybe detailed records should have been kept. Sorry 'bout that.

❧ RESEARCH FORUM ❧

== WHO WAS H. N. RUST ? (RF-21; CNL, July 1968, p. 23) ==

We have received a number of lengthy letters on the subject of H.N.Rust and his association with the Fugio "New Haven Restrikes" from Robert J. Lindesmith of Dayton, Washington. Bob's concepts cover a wide range of ideas and facts concerning usage of dies in this country during the mid-1800's and the personalities associated with this era of American numismatics. While this time period does not directly relate to Colonial American Numismatics, the so-called restrikes from original (circa 1787) dies certainly does concern us, especially since there has been considerable speculation concerning these specimens over the years.

We have extracted from his letters some of Bob's findings and opinions on the identity of H.N.Rust and those with whom he may have been associated. In a future issue we hope to present additional data on this subject as Bob manages to sort out and assemble more of the pieces of this puzzle.

●➤ I have had a fascinating time over the past few weeks in trying to establish some relationship between the intriguing information supplied in the Don Taxay article, The Fugio Cents - Restrikes or Fabrications?, October 1968 issue of Coins, and the material that I have uncovered in my research on the restriking, muling, hubbing and altering of old dies that took place in the U. S. between 1859 and 1889. While I have not made a serious study of the Fugio s, I believe the CNL patrons will find the reference to H. N. Rust of some interest.

While I did not attach any great significance to the Research Forum inquiry for information on H. N. Rust in The Colonial Newsletter, Taxay's failure to mention the restrikes sold from Chicago led me to dig through my unfiled notes. Lo and behold!--the following information copied from a December 18, 1914, sale held by Lyman H. Low (Lot 6):

"1787 Fugio Cent in silver. From dies found in New Haven, by the late C. Wyllys Betts. Soon after, they became the property of H. N. Rust of Chicago, who struck copies from them, and issued a circular advertising them for sale. Later, about 1878, Capt. J. W. Haseltine and the late J. Colvin Randall came into possession of the dies, and struck specimens in gold, silver and bronze. Following this last emission, I believe the dies were destroyed. About pfct. 180 grs."

At the time I copied this item, I was working on background material for my article on Mason & Co. 1870 Store Cards which appeared in the TAMS JOURNAL, IV-122, CORRECTIONS IV-161. This article, in part, covers the odd use made of old dies in Philadelphia around 1870.

I believe Low obtained his information on the New Haven restrikes from his sale of the Groh Collection. Under Lot 30 of the May 17, 1905 sale he makes a brief reference to Betts, Rust and Randall.

In respect to the identity of the true New Haven restrikes, I would be inclined to believe that the following listings found in the catalog of the Benjamin Haines' collection of Elizabeth, N. J., which was sold in January 19-23, 1863, by Bangs, Merwin & Co. would pinpoint the 104-FF variety:

- |          |  |
|----------|--|
| Lot 1987 | 1787 Franklin, struck in silver; re-struck from the original dies. |
| Lot 1988 | 1787 Franklin, re-struck in copper, from original dies.            |

As Haines prepared the catalog and since his collection of U.S. Store Cards contained a large number of mules and restrikes struck by the Scoville Manufacturing Co., his reference to restrikes from original dies would certainly indicate that the Waterbury firm used original dies, in some form, to create the so-called restrikes.

In checking through some recently acquired Woodward catalogs, I found the following fascinating entry from the William J. Jenks collection of Philadelphia Auction. (January 10-13, 1881 --- Elliot Woodward):

- |          |  |
|----------|--|
| Lot 1544 | H. N. Rust. Bust; rev., inscrip.; bronze, proof. Size 20 (32 mm.). |
|----------|--|

That the above piece could have been struck by the Scoville firm is indicated by the following entry in a March 6-11, 1882, Woodward catalog:

- |         |   |
|---------|---|
| Lot 749 | Medal of Stephen H. Tyng. The dies of this medal were recently destroyed by a fire in Waterbury; it is very rare, fine. Bronze Size 20. |
|---------|---|

The Rust medal would seem to leave little doubt that a H. N. Rust did exist and could serve as additional proof that Rust very likely was responsible for the New Haven restrikes. Possibly the inscription on the reverse of this medal would shed some additional light on the subject.

Another interesting entry is found in a May 18-19, 1881, auction catalog:

Lot 690    A. B. Sage's Numismatic Gallery, Uncirculated,  
Size 20, 7 pieces, Henry Bogert, Winslow Lewis,  
M.D., C. I. Bushnell, Frank Jaundon, William  
H. Chesley, Robert J. Dodge, Horatio N. Rust.

With the 690 entry in mind, the legend on the obverse die of the A. B. Sage store card of New York City, Adams 753, 754, 755, and 756 (Silver-Copper-Brass-White Metal), Size 20, becomes significant:

A. B. SAGE & CO./ DEALERS IN / COINS / MEDALS &  
TOKENS / BOOKS, STATIONERY / ENGRAVING & PRINTINGS /  
AUTOGRAPHS & CURIOSITIES / CIRCULATING LIBRARY /  
24 DIVISION ST. / NEW YORK. / 1860

As the dies for the various Sage issues were prepared and struck by George H. Lovett, we can be rather certain that Rust sold the three Fugio dies to Sage and that it was Lovett who did not succeed in striking from them.

Just as in the above case, I'm sure that all the pieces of the New Haven jigsaw puzzle do exist. And while I'm not certain of the position of some pieces, it does seem possible that it can be worked out along the lines of the article that appeared in the 1873 issue of the American Journal of Numismatics. If this is true, it would appear that the history of the New Haven dies is not as "sordid" as indicated by Taxay.



❧ ❧ ❧ COMMENTS ON THE FUGIO CENTS OF 1787 ❧ ❧ ❧

● ● The NEW HAVEN RESTRIKES

This is the fourth article in my rambling series of comments on the Fugio Cents of 1787. In my previous article which appeared in the January 1967 issue of CNL, I discussed the "problem" of the Club Ray Fugios and presented my thoughts on these items. I referred to the Club Rays as one of the mysteries associated with the Fugio issue. In this current group of comments, I will discuss another "problem" associated with the Fugios--that of the "New Haven Restrikes."

The "New Haven Restrikes" are generally considered to be coinage struck from "original" dies "discovered" by fourteen year old C. Wyllys Betts in 1858 on the site of the Broome and Platt Store in New Haven, Connecticut. These specimens occur in a variety of metals, most commonly copper, brass, silver and gold and are reported also in white metal, lead, nickle and in uniface as well as double sided configurations. They also occur overstruck on other coinage. They are usually thought of as the die variety combination 104-FF as designated by Eric P. Newman in his *Varieties of The Fugio Cent* (The Coin Collector's Journal, July-August 1952); however, there are a considerable number of dies (six or seven) and impressions which belong to the New Haven family as well as 104 and FF, some of which have in the past been considered patterns. These are tabulated in Table 1 and diagrammed in Figure A along with other specimens of uncertain origin.

Figure A is an expansion of the Fugio "New Haven" and "pattern" die inter-relationship chart developed by Damon G. Douglas in his manuscript James Jarvis and the Fugio Coppers (at ANS) and presented in his chapter titled "Specimens and Dies of Uncertain Origin." To the basic Douglas diagram, I have added the other known specimens for reference and to make the figure consistent with the tabulation of Table 1. Douglas designators are used in Figure A since he has compiled the most comprehensive tabulation of varieties; Newman designators are added for clarity where appropriate. In addition, the location of the extant dies is indicated. The solid lines on the chart indicate known specimens struck from the connected dies; dotted lines indicate the use of identical or near-identical (modified) hubs used in manufacturing the dies but does not indicate mating of dies in struck specimens. In addition to these, I have examined several specimens which appear to be none of those shown on the chart; however, they are rather poorly struck or worn to the extent that they defy classification on the basis of minutiae.



When I use the term "New Havens" in this article, I refer to those diagrammed in Figure A enclosed within the dashed area. Some of the impressions outside of this area may also be closely related but I am not yet certain of their specific relationship to those I have designated here as New Havens. In his CCJ article Eric Newman designated only 104-FF as the emission from New Haven dies, and classified everything else as patterns inasmuch as one or both dies differed from the final design approved by the Continental Congress.

In his article in the October 1968 issue of Coins on the Fugio "New Havens" and "Patterns", Don Taxay classifies the New Havens and some of the patterns as fabrications originating from new master dies from which hubs and working dies were afterwards multiplied, and he dismisses Mr. H. N. Rust, the supposed originator, as a pseudonym whose real identity remains unknown.

While I agree with Mr. Taxay on many of his observations, there is so very much more to the New Haven "problem" and to the identity of Mr. H.N. Rust and his association with the New Haven dies that I believe it worthwhile to discuss it with our CNL patrons.

First, I suggest that recent work by Robert J. Lindesmith of Dayton, Washington, which is summarized in part in his comments in the Research Forum appearing in this issue, establish beyond any doubt that there was in fact an individual named Horatio N. Rust, that he was active in the numismatic community in the mid-1800's, and that his reported usage of dies to the editor of the American Journal of Numismatics was probably factual.

Secondly, my personal studies of the emissions from the extant New Haven dies together with the genuine Fugio emissions have led me to the conclusion that the New Haven obverse dies are transfer dies from a hub raised originally from a genuine Fugio die--specifically Newman's Obverse Number 5. The original transfer hub was, I believe, extensively reworked and retransferred to produce the series of "New Haven" obverses. I believe sufficient evidence from the genuine Fugio Obverse Number 5 die remains on the New Haven obverses to support this conclusion.

If one is to accept the proposition that the New Haven dies are of nineteenth century fabrication--regardless of the mechanism by which the dies were produced--an immediate question presents itself. Why? Why would anyone go to the time, effort, and trouble to produce an extensive group of hubs and dies, and numerous strikings. The Fugios have never been very popular as a collector's item. Even today, this first authorized coinage of our country goes essentially unnoticed, being passed by, paradoxically, as a simple "Colonial."

The answer to this question lies, I believe, in the numismatic cabinet of the long departed Charles I. Bushnell. Many of these uncertain specimens, in particular 99-XX, 99-YY, and 98-XX, first came to numismatic notice all in uncirculated mint condition in the cabinet of Bushnell, the 98-XX in silver and copper, the 99-YY in silver, brass and copper, and the 98-XX in silver and brass. Their owner's reticence regarding their source and that of other of his "unique" precious metal specimens cast doubt upon these when they were later offered at auction. Further, much of the information on these and other Fugio "patterns" was obtained by Crosby from Bushnell and are the basis for cuts in his book.(after Douglas).

There are two possibilities that come to mind. The first and probably most plausible is that all of the pieces were manufactured for the purpose of sale to Bushnell as unique patterns for his collection, Bushnell later recognizing that he had been duped and therefore reluctant to discuss their origin. The other--a somewhat less likely possibility--would be that Bushnell was directly involved with H. N. Rust in their manufacture for personal purposes of acquiring unique prestige pieces in his cabinet. Whatever may have been the personal involvement of Bushnell, the fact remains that his cabinet contributed, almost exclusively, the rarest and most unique "New Havens" and Fugio "patterns" to the numismatic fraternity.

I believe that one could accept the argument that some unusual mint state items would add a spectacular attraction to the Bushnell cabinet but I doubt that Bushnell would knowingly be a party to their manufacture. On the other hand, it is reasonable to believe that Bushnell could have been "taken" in some degree of fraud or misrepresentation as to the nature of the pieces, especially if the perpetrator were no stranger to Bushnell.

Whatever may have been discovered by C. Wyllys Betts on the Broome and Platt site, and independently discovered earlier by Rust, it probably consisted of tools as well as dies or hubs, most likely rusty and requiring some rework before any striking was possible and probably extensive rework before nice specimens could be obtained. I am convinced that the cinque-foils appearing on the New Haven obverses are genuine--circa 1787--and probably made from a "discovered" tool. As for the New Haven reverses, these too I suspect had their origin in a genuine Fugio die, or hub, the rings being considerably reworked and narrowed in the process of removal of rust or other damage; however, I have not done enough work with these reverses to draw any conclusions as to the identity of the die.

Mr. Rust's group of dies, after doing their critical service of producing the Bushnell specimens and others sold from Chicago, apparently passed through successive ownership, producing additional assorted strikings along the way until today the known five remaining dies are impounded in museum collections.

For several years, I had believed that the New Havens were simply copies of Fugio Obverse No. 5. The pointed chin of the sun and the concave club rays were of course the most direct evidence of a pure copy. The similarity of the concave end heavy rays is quite evident; much less obvious is the fact that a die peculiarity causes worn specimens of Obverse No. 5 to exhibit a sun with a pointed chin. Other similarities which are arguments for the copy theory are:

- a. Small second S in BUSINESS
- b. Added flourishes on each side of the dialplate support
- c. Shape, position and configuration of the dialplate fleurons; five left, four right, plus center dot
- d. Heavy horizontal lines on dialplate support
- e. Lower baseline to sundial.

Dissimilarities are important also. None of the genuine Club Ray Fugios are ornamented between the dialplate numerals. This fact was probably not recognized by the New Haven die sinkers who proceeded to add them to their reconstructed dies or hubs but in such a manner that they appear incuse on the specimens rather than raised as they are on genuine (Fine Ray) Fugios. Additionally, the heavy cyclic line between the dialplate and its support was omitted.

The following data is that which leads me to the conclusion that the New Haven obverse dies were derived from the genuine Fugio Obverse No. 5. In my comments on the Club Ray Fugios in the January 1967 issue of CNL, I mentioned for Obverse No. 5 the "dialplate background is a series of diagonal and horizontal lines forming various parallelogram patterns." This unusual pattern in the interior of the dialplate is unique to Obverse No. 5 and has both random and regular characteristics determined, I believe, principally by the various starting points used by the die sinker when scribing these lines. This unique pattern managed to survive all the rework and multiple transferring of designs and carried over to the final New Haven dies. Only a vestige of the pattern remains, but it is unmistakably present on all the New Haven obverses. The fact that it is a vestigial design and not boldly reconstructed is evidence that it was not included as part of a copying exercise. It was with my recognition of this unique vestigial pattern within the dialplate of the New Havens that I reached the conclusion that the New Haven Obverses were not simply copies, but had been raised from a genuine Fugio die--Newman's Obverse No. 5. This obverse and one of the New Havens are illustrated for comparison on the frontispiece of this issue. A photographic overlay of the genuine Obverse No. 5 on any of the New Haven obverses reveals almost perfect correlation of all features except the cinquefoil positions.

I also believe one other direct identifiable vestige remains from the Obverse No. 5 die, this is the right center fleuron within the dialplate. The new fleuron punched into each of the new dies failed to completely hide the older fleuron from the original die. This original fleuron appears essentially unretouched on the Mattatuck die (Douglas 94).

These New Haven dies were carefully and skillfully reconstructed to restore the design - what little of it may have remained on the original die - and then probably used for striking Bushnell's pieces as well as those offered for sale by Rust. How much of the story of the "reconstruction" was made public by Rust remains to be determined.

I agree with Robert Lindesmith's observation that the history of the New Havens may not be as "sordid" as indicated by Taxay; I suggest that it will eventually be shown that what actually occurred was a relatively straightforward group of strikings from "reconstructed" dies performed under the direction of some enthusiastic numismatists who, failing to obtain copies suitable for display or sale from old dies in poor condition, had the best ones of the old dies reproduced and offered strikings from these instead of the originals. At the very worst, I suggest that the New Havens are "struck copies!"

Why not?

In a future group of comments I will describe all of these New Haven varieties so that collectors can distinguish one from another. Most have one or two diagnostic features allowing positive identification. For example, the Yale University die impression (Douglas 95) on the frontispiece is much bolder in the right ray structure than any of the other obverses, has a small die defect resembling a crack across the left side of the sun face, and a bold dot just to the left of the Y in YOUR.

As usual, comments and criticism regarding my concepts will be welcomed.

Errata: In my comments on the Fugio Cents of 1787 appearing in the January 1967 issue of CNL, please change the last line of the first paragraph of page 42 to read . . . and 3 from which issued the majority of the Club Ray coinage.

